



Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

122

FILING DATE FIRST NAMED APPLICANT ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. SERIAL NUMBER 06/543,880 18/20/83 TAKAYA т 182730CTP182

TOBLON, FISHER, SPIVAK, MC CLELLAND & MATER CRYSTAL SQUARE FIVE, STE. 400 1755 S. JEFF. DAVIS HNY.

EXAMINER COUGHLAN-P ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

ARLINGTON, VA 22202 This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

DATE MAILED: 1.2717784

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on	This action is made final.
2	
shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire month(s),	days from the date of this letter.
allure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become aband	oned. 35 U.S.C. 133
art I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:	
1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 2. Notice	ce re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
A Notice	ce of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152
3	
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, P10-1474	
art II SUMMARY OF ACTION	
1 2 3	are pending in the application.
1. Claims / - 2 J	are pending in the apprication.
•	
Of the above, claims	are withdrawn from consideration.
2. Claims	have been cancelled.
3. Claims	are allowed.
4. 🗵 Claims 1-23	are rejected.
·	
5. Claims	are objected to.
5. Claims	-
6. Claims	are subject to restriction or election requirement.
6. Claims	010 000,000 10 10000000000000000000
	in-ties purposes until such time as allowable subject
7. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for	examination purposes until such time as arrowable subject
matter is indicated.	
8. [] Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.	
9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on	These drawings are acceptable;
not acceptable (see explanation).	
10 The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed additional or sub-	stitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on
has (have) been approved by the examiner. disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).	
has (have) been approved by the examiner disapproved by the examiner.	
11. The proposed drawing correction, filed, has been	approved [] disapproved (see explanation). However,
11. The proposed drawing correction, filed, has been	
the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. It is now a	ppiricant's responsionity to ensure that the drawings are
corrected. Corrections MUST be effected in accordance with the instructions so	et forth on the attached letter "INFORMATION ON HOW IN
EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.	
12. Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The cer	tified copy has been received 🔀 not been received
been filed in parent application, serial no.	filed on
the increase of the self-energy except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in	
accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	
accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 435 C.D.	
14 CT Other	

Serial No. 543880

Art Unit 122

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority based on an application filed in Great Britain on October 20, 1984. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the British application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119.

2

This application does not contain an Abstract of the Disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An Abstract on a separate sheet is required.

The content of a patent abstract should enable the reader, regardless of the degree of familiarity with patent documents, to ascertain quickly the character of the subject matter covered by the technical disclosure, and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. The abstract is not intended nor designed for use in interpreting the scope or meaning of the claims, 37 CFR 1.172 (b).

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-24 and 1-25 of applicant's copending applications Serial Nos. 579,954 and 638,784. This is a double patenting rejection.

Claims 20, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs, as the claimed invention is not described in such full, clear, concise and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the same, and/or for failing to par-

Serial No. 543880

Art Unit 122

3

ticularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Markush group of processes is not proper since there are various divergent reactants and products in said processes. See MPEP Section 706.03 (y). Claim 22 is not clearly directed to any particular type of pharmaceutical composition containing any amount of cepbrens. The term "use of a compounds" does not definitely define a method of treatment.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Numata et al .

The claimed processes are considered obvius since they are well known with such closesly related celpheno Serial No.

543880

Art Unit

122

as those of Numata et al. Weir and Clark et al are cited to show state of the art in relation to 3-vinyl cephalosporins.

Coughlan:wcg

A/C 703

557-3920

12/13/84

defolders

Donald G. Dāus Supervisory Patent Examine Art Unit 122